

Another Look at Smoke Detector Ordinances

Strategic Analysis of Community Risk Reduction

BY: James W. Dwertman
St. Bernard Fire Department
St. Bernard, Ohio
dwertmjw@ix.netcom.com

An applied research project submitted to the National Fire Academy as part of the
Executive Fire Officer Program
February 1999

ABSTRACT

The problem is the current smoke detector legislation, adopted in 1980, should be reevaluated since it only applies to only a few three family or more occupancies. Certain public officials believe a more comprehensive smoke detector ordinance might be more appropriate.

The purpose of this applied research paper is to examine the public's attitude about smoke detectors and smoke detection legislation. Based upon this examination, develop a smoke detector ordinance for city council to adopt with a minimum of public objection.

This research paper uses descriptive and evaluative research methods to answer the following questions:

1. Do the citizens of St. Bernard feel smoke detectors should be in installed in the home?
2. Would the citizens of St. Bernard accept legislation requiring the installation and maintenance of smoke detection equipment in their homes?
3. Is the fire department's current smoke detector program effectively reaching the citizens?

Fire department personnel distributed a survey instrument to the one thousand, six hundred and fifty-six households in the city during the fall home safety check program. Three hundred and ten surveys were returned for evaluation resulting in a 95% confidence level in the results.

The results of the analysis of the responses to the citizen's survey clearly answers the three research questions.

1. The citizens of St. Bernard feel very strongly that smoke detectors should be installed in the home (99%).
2. A solid majority would accept legislation that would require the installation of these smoke detectors (85%).

3. The current fire department smoke detector programs are effectively reaching the citizens (75%) but there is room for improved effectiveness

Based upon these findings an ordinance should be prepared and adopted that would modify the Property Maintenance Code of the City St. Bernard to require every occupancy in the City of St. Bernard to comply with NFPA 72, 72E and 72H. Additionally, some special community programs should be developed to positively promote the new ordinance as well as reinforce the department's current smoke detector programs. When considering the fire department programs, a special emphasis should be placed on smoke detector maintenance because of the universal significance of this problem.

Table of Contents

Abstract..... i

Table of Contents..... ii

Introduction..... 1

Background and Significance..... 2

Literature Review..... 5

Procedures..... 10

Results..... 15

Discussion..... 19

Recommendations.....21

References..... 22

Appendix A..... 24

Appendix B..... 34

INTRODUCTION

The problem is the current smoke detector legislation, adopted in 1980, needs to be reconsidered since it only applies to only certain three family or more occupancies. The fire administration feels the effectiveness of smoke detectors to make occupants aware of an incipient level fire, reducing fire damage by helping with early detection and ultimately saving lives is not subject to controversy. Smoke detector technology is economical and it is time for more definitive legislation. This legislation, which would require certain minimum requirements for all occupancies, is necessary to help assure adequate fire protection for the entire community.

The purpose of this applied research paper is to examine the public's attitude about smoke detectors and smoke detection legislation. Based upon this examination, develop as exhaustive smoke detector ordinance as possible for city council to adopt with a minimum of public objection.

This research paper uses descriptive and evaluative research methods to answer the following questions:

1. Do the citizens of St. Bernard feel smoke detectors should be in installed in the home?
3. Would the citizens of St. Bernard accept legislation requiring the installation and maintenance of smoke detection equipment in their homes?
3. Is the fire department's current smoke detector program effectively reaching the citizens?

BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE

On September 4, 1980 Mayor Jack J. Hausfeld signed into law Ordinance No. 40, 1980. This ordinance established minimum standards governing the conditions and maintenance of all structures and dwellings in the City of St. Bernard. These standards were documented in a document known as the Basic Property Maintenance Code. It would be duty and responsibility of the local code official to enforce the Basic Property Maintenance Code.

Section 1335.82 (a) of this code required:

' . . . A minimum early fire warning system shall be installed and in operation in every three or more family dwelling, apartment, condominium and dormitory building which does not have an automatic smoke detection system or sprinkler system in conformity with the rules of the Board of Building Standards . . . '

This was a bold, progressive position to embrace back in 1980, or so we thought, and one the fire department was proud to support. The requirement was easy to justify to the public solely on the argument that a landlord had certain responsibilities to its tenants and these obligations were generally based on the moneymaking aspect of the relationship.

The real impetus developed from the ease in which the requirement was justified. City council preferred to focus on a landlord issue and did not address the real need of getting smoke detectors installed in every home. Legislators easily avoided some tough obstacles like the right to privacy. Enforcement problems would be rare because tenants usually had no problem voluntarily allowing the

inspectors into their apartment and consequently any need for public support was small.

Consider for a moment that there are 1455 properties (a lot with a dwelling) in the City of St. Bernard. Section 1335.82 of the Basic Property Maintenance Code affects only 95 of those dwellings. Consequently, only 6.5% of the properties in St. Bernard are required, by ordinance, to have smoke detectors. The remaining 93.5% of the existing properties and all of the other existing occupancies¹, built prior to 1992, are under no statutory requirement for mandatory fire detection equipment. The time has arrived to reexamine the statutory requirements for mandating smoke detectors.

From an organizational perspective public fire departments usually are expected to provide public goods. From a fiscal point of view, a primary characteristic of a public good is its nonappropriability. A private firm or business would not provide the service because it would be unable to charge an appropriate fee to cover the cost of resources and still realize a profit. As such, the ensuing principles of public goods must follow:

- < Available to any number of people without diminishing its availability to any other number of people (**nonexhaustion or nonrivalry**).
- < Once available, all are equally entitled to the same type and quality of service (**nonexclusion**).

¹Places of assembly, business, education, mercantile, high hazard, institutional, storage, factory and industrial, utility and miscellaneous as defined by Ohio Revised Code.

In the case of a fire department the public good is fire protection, not fire fighting. When the personnel and equipment are busy putting out the fire at Mr. Jones' house it is not available to extinguish a blaze anywhere else, thereby violating the nonrivalry principle. Controlling and extinguishing Mr. Jones' fire, however, will prevent the blaze from spreading thereby providing protection equally to Mr. Jones' neighbors complying with the principle of nonexclusion (Mikesell, 1995).

By requiring smoke detectors in every occupancy the number of alarms will be reduced. The device will warn occupants very early into the fire. The resident may have time to act appropriately and eliminate any need for a fire department response. In the event the fire has already progressed to the point the resident cannot handle it, a smoke alarm will hasten its discovery resulting in smaller fires (USFA, 1997). This will allow the fire fighting crews to provide the needed protection to the neighbors while reducing the amount of time spent exclusively on Mr. Jones' problem (nonrivalry principle). The resulting efficiency of economies can have a long reaching impact on any organization and a compelling effect on its immediate future.

In the *Strategic Analysis of Community Risk Reduction* Course unit seven emphasized public policy intervention for changing behavior to reduce risk. It stressed that successful public policy is usually dependent on three factors: technology, data and/or political situations/climate. The survey generated from this project will serve as a barometer to allow for the accurate judgment of the current political situation/climate. One may learn from this what is necessary for the public to accept a comprehensive, mandatory smoke detector ordinance.

LITERATURE REVIEW

One philosophy the National Fire Academy's *Strategic Analysis of Community Risk Reduction* (SACRR) course emphasized was if it is predictable and preventable it's no accident. It should not be considered an accident that people continue to perish in fires although Hall and Harwood (1995) note that the total number of fire deaths is continuing to decline over recent years. It was learned, however, that the share of fire deaths due to smoke inhalation is increasing steadily by over 1 percent a year when compare to deaths from burns. The authors are quick to point out that although the actual number of fires is decreasing the chance of dying in one of these fires is increasing.

For preventing a predictable event the SACRR student manual (1997b) suggested three methods of intervention: Engineering, Education and Enforcement. A smoke detector is an example of an engineering intervention. The United States witnessed a remarkable growth in the use of home smoke detectors for about a decade beginning around 1975. This trend leveled off as the installation and use of smoke detectors continued to grow at lesser but steady rate. Current figures suggest that about only one in twelve homes in the United States have not installed at least one smoke detector thereby decreasing by 40 percent their chances of dying in a home fire (Hall, 1994).

Along with the widespread acceptance of this technology developed the need for better smoke detector performance. When and why do they fail? The public needs the second form of intervention - education - to maximize the smoke detector's effectiveness.

The vast majority of homes are reported to have smoke detectors yet 32 percent of these homes reportedly had a fire in which the smoke detector did not function properly. Fifty-nine percent of

these failures were due to a lack of a power source. An on-site study was done on smoke detectors and it was found that 25 percent of the smoke detectors did not respond to either the activation of a test button or aerosol smoke. Of this 25 percent 60 percent of the smoke detectors had a missing or disconnected power source, almost the identical statistics reported in real life, fire related circumstances (Smith, Smith, Ayres, 1997).

Most of the smoke detector failures are associated with failed power sources. Further study of this problem would reveal several factors related to the power failures. Reports indicate that smoke detector failures in apartments were less frequent since apartments were more likely to have statutory requirements associated with their installation and maintenance. It was also felt many homeowners would neglect their smoke detectors since they were solely responsible for them (USFA, 1997a).

Nuisance alarms outnumber genuine fire alarms by 16 to 1. This fact seems to account for many smoke alarm failures due to disconnected power sources (Hall, 1994). Consider the type of smoke alarm to install in a particular area to reduce nuisance alarms. Ionization type alarms are better at detecting small particles of combustion. About 87 percent of all home smoke detectors are ionization detectors (Smith et. al., 1997). They are more sensitive than the photoelectric alarms that need the larger particles of combustion produced by smoldering fires to activate them. The use of the photoelectric type of smoke detector in kitchens and near bathrooms is recommended since they are more resistant to false activation from moisture and cooking vapors (Bunker, 1998).

Other reasons commonly cited for smoke detector failure include its location. Improper installation could put a smoke detector in an air "dead space" and the smoke unable to flow to the detector. An Ohio man purchased but never installed his smoke detector. This disabled man awoke

during a fire but too late to escape. A new smoke detector, still in the box, was found in the rubble (Conley, Fahy, 1994).

In more recent times the age of a smoke detector has come into consideration regarding its performance. As smoke detector technology becomes older the age of this technology becomes increasingly significant. The U.S. Fire Administration recognized the need to occasionally replace smoke detectors. They recommended in the 1993 booklet "Protecting your Family from Fire," that smoke detectors be replaced, even if apparently in good working condition, every ten years. The publication went on to point out that smoke detectors are so economically priced it is not worth the risk to keep an old, possibly unreliable detector in service rather than purchase a new one.

Failed power sources, nuisance alarms, uninstalled or old detectors are all issues in which intervention through education can be successful. A comprehensive, public education policy should decrease the occurrences of failed smoke detection equipment. Many fire departments' may already have some kind of smoke detector/battery program but are the "right" people aware of these programs?

If the **Engineering** is firmly in place and after an exhaustive **Education** program the public is still reluctant to embrace it, the third type of intervention is probably necessary. **Enforcement** of legislation is sometimes, unfortunately, the only way to help people help themselves (USFA, 1997b).

Attitudes appear naturally resistant to change. People in the United States tolerate fire as a reality, view it as inevitable and consider insurance their protection from fire loss. It seems stereotypical to view a disastrous fire as something that happens to the other guy. In dealing with culturally based attitudes such as these are when enforcement measures may become the only effective form of intervention (USFA, 1997c).

Many problems are associated with intervention by enforcement. Entry to a house for an enforcement inspection is often restricted. Asking EMS or other emergency response personnel to "look around" while on the scene is, to say at the least, very distracting. Often enforcement issues become the building department's realm of authority (Coleman, 1992). Respect for property rights and individual liberties is always a major concern (Maughan, 1992; Bright, 1992).

A positive approach to the issue of enforcement can remove some citizen's apprehensions. Chief Gaiser (1993) reported on the "Blue Ribbon Campaign" in which community volunteers canvassed the neighborhoods, interviewing home owners and tenants about their smoke detectors. If the house met all the smoke detector requirements a large blue ribbon was awarded and prominently displayed on the home's exterior. If the house were not in compliance then fire department personnel would offer to help them meet the requirements.

Maughan (1992) suggested a "Fixit Ticket." A fixit ticket gave the owner or tenant an alternative to appearing in court and paying a fine. The citation would automatically be dismissed upon proof of installation of the proper equipment. He also suggested that the fines from those that did not take advantage of the "Fixit Ticket" be held in a special fund to finance a four-step program. This program included installation and testing of smoke detectors, supplying batteries and the development/practice of home fire escape plans.

Other suggestions included a requirement for compliance with smoke detector legislation upon the sale of the home or issuance of a building permit (Coleman, 1992; Bright, 1992).

Summary

The literature review proved what I suspected all along. Although many communities may have

some sort of smoke detector ordinance, few have, what I consider, a comprehensive one. Research proves and there seems to be universal acceptance of the value of having your home protected by smoke detectors. Most local and state jurisdictions have strict requirements for newly constructed homes but become reticent about applying them to existing structures. Tough issues concerning a few citizens' reactions and problems concerning enforcement emerge and usually result in weakened ordinances.

I feel my research will show that the majority of the citizens will support an extensive smoke detector ordinance. The literature review has provided some positive approaches to the compliance issues that may help modify the attitudes of the remaining antagonists. With this knowledge the fire service can promote a successful smoke detector program supported by convincing legislation and still maintain the confidence and support of the citizenry.

PROCEDURES

Survey Development

Before developing and distributing any survey to the citizens, it was necessary to meet with the mayor and safety director to brief them on the content and purpose of the survey. In this meeting it was decided to develop a survey that covered more than just the smoke detector issue. There were other issues being considered by the fire department that input from the citizens would be very valuable. It would also be more cost effective to cover many issues in a single survey. One final consideration was that by addressing a variety of issues in the survey no particular emphasis would be perceived by the public and consequently reduces the possibility of premature controversy.

In addition, at this meeting the importance of meeting with civic groups and organizations before distribution of the survey was discussed. It was thought that by briefing these organizations in advance and by giving them an opportunity to ask questions, the fire administration would have a better "feel" for the public's reception to the survey and hopefully lessen the citizens' anxiety.

This decision significantly contributed to the total success of the survey. Much of the apprehension usually associated with such a survey was alleviated or reduced. Many telephone calls were received from citizens who were anxiously waiting for the distribution of the survey fearing they had been missed.

The Survey

Question #2 of the survey was designed to help answer the first research question of whether the citizens of St. Bernard felt smoke detectors should be installed in their homes?

2. *Do you feel that every private residence should have working smoke detectors?*
 Yes _____ NO _____

Question #1, #3 and #4 were designed to help answer the second research question concerning mandatory legislation on the installation and maintenance of smoke detection equipment.

1. *Do you feel that the City should pass an ordinance to require smoke detectors in ALL rental property?*
 Yes _____ NO _____
3. *Do you feel that the City should pass an ordinance that would require every private residence to be equipped with working smoke detectors?*
 Yes _____ No _____
4. *Would you support an ordinance requiring smoke detectors in every private residence if the Fire Department would supply, install and help maintain them?*
 Yes _____ No _____

Questions #5 and #6 were designed to help answer the third research question concerning whether the current fire department smoke detector programs were reaching the people.

5. *Are you aware that FREE batteries are available from the fire department for smoke detectors in private residences?*
 Yes _____ No _____
6. *Are you aware that the fire department will come to your home to help you with a smoke detector related problem?*
 Yes _____ No _____

Distribution

The St. Bernard Fire Department goes out into the community every fall to offer a ***Fire Safety***

Check for every home in the city. The city is divided into three areas, and each of the three fire department units takes responsibility for visiting every home in their assigned area. If somebody is home, then the offer to conduct an inspection is made, and the homeowner has the option of allowing the firefighter into their home to check the basement and garage areas. If the homeowner chooses not to allow the inspection, then a checklist is given to help them conduct their own inspection of the house. While at the home, the firefighter will offer to check smoke detectors and provide free replacement batteries if needed.

If nobody answers then a slip is left at the home explaining we were in the neighborhood and if they want an inspection, they should call the firehouse for a convenient appointment. Since, as a matter of record keeping, a list is made of each home visited it was felt this would be a good way to distribute the survey and maintain accountability of the survey population.

A educational package was developed using free smoke detector and exit drill literature available from the State Fire Marshal's Office and a burn prevention tip pamphlet from the Shriners Burns Institute. Promotional rulers and litterbags were purchased. The literature, rulers and survey questionnaires were placed in the litterbags. One packet was delivered to each household during the regular annual home inspection visit.

All members of the fire department were briefed on the survey and instructed to forward any questions from the public directly to the fire chief. They were also instructed to accept any completed surveys from the citizens and give them to the officer in charge. The officer in charge was also asked to honor any citizen's request to pick up a completed survey if staffing levels were adequate.

Population

Each of the one thousand, six hundred and fifty-six households in the City of St. Bernard received a survey bag. Arrangements were made so that any citizen could drop off a completed survey at city hall, police or fire department buildings. Instructions were also provided on the survey form for mailing the survey directly to the fire department.

A total of three hundred and ten returned surveys is necessary to achieve a 95% confidence level in the survey results (Krejcie, et al., 1970). Every household receives council minutes. Included in these minutes was a message reminding citizens to fill out and return the survey. Follow up visits were made to the civic groups and city organizations to answer any questions, address concerns and pick up completed surveys. These efforts would serve as a reminder to complete the survey and make it as convenient as possible to return the completed survey form.

Limitations

The decision to survey households rather than the entire population was because an exact count of households was available. This also eliminated any problems concerning age requirements for the survey. It was felt that the person most likely to manifest political ramifications to the various topics would be the one to take the time and fill out the survey.

One possibility not anticipated was that both a husband and wife would complete a survey together. This would not affect the reliability of the answers but might compromise any assumptions based on demographics. When reviewing comments on the survey, it was sometimes possible to learn the gender of the person completing the survey based on comments they made. For instance, one participant made a reference to what her husband thought. In this case that survey was considered to be completed by a female. In the few remaining cases the responses were assigned a gender on a

rotating basis in each age group. The completed survey only counted as one response in every case.

Many surveys were returned incomplete. Every answered question was coded and scored. Some surveys included comments expressing a concern for having the qualifications to make an informed decision. All percentages were based on the total number of survey forms returned. Because of the incomplete questionnaires, the percentages will not add up to 100%. Final tabulations were 210 female responses and 110 male responses for a total of 320 surveys included in this study.

Definition of Terms

For this study, a **household** is defined as dwelling or section of dwelling capable of housing a family unit. For instance, a two or three family housing unit would have a survey delivered to the entrance of each individual section whether it was known to be occupied or not. With apartment buildings and condominiums a survey bag was placed on the door knob of the primary entrance of each unit. If two families lived in the same single family house (i.e. caring for elderly parent(s) etc.) only one survey bag was delivered.

Do the citizens of St. Bernard feel smoke detectors should be installed in the home?

There were several ways to approach this question. Ultimately it was decided to keep it simple and present the following question directly to the citizen.

- The above data indicates that the public obviously supports the feeling that every private residence should have working smoke detectors. Out of the entire sample only four respondents (1%) indicated any opposition to the idea. Two hundred and seventy-nine respondents (99%) supported the concept of smoke detectors in every residence. The answer to the first research question is clearly the citizens of St. Bernard feel that smoke detectors should be installed in every home.

It is established that the citizens of St. Bernard feel every home should be protected with smoke detectors. It now has to be determined if they will accept legislation requiring these smoke detectors. An evaluation of the responses to questions #1, 3 and 4 of the citizen's survey was used to formulate an answer to this second research question.

Would the Citizens of St. Bernard accept legislation requiring the installation of smoke detectors in their homes?

1. *Do you feel that the City should pass an ordinance to require smoke detectors in ALL rental property?*

YES 292 (95%)

NO 14 (5%)

3. *Do you feel that the City should pass an ordinance that would require every private residence to be equipped with working smoke detectors?*

YES 236 (78%)

NO 67 (22%)

4. *Would you support an ordinance requiring smoke detectors in every private residence if the Fire Department would supply, install and help maintain them?*

YES 231 (76%)

NO 72 (24%)

Unsurprisingly, the analysis of the above data indicates that the public still feels it is acceptable to legislate fire protection for tenants. Ninety-five percent of the respondents to question #1 felt this way. Only 14 respondents (5%) indicated any opposition to legislation to require smoke detectors in rental property.

Question #3 shows that as expected, support for smoke detector legislation, when applied to a private residence, seems to decline. Only 78% of the respondents to this question feel that legislation is necessary for private residences. Seventy-eight percent is still a solid majority and certainly strong enough support to justify further consideration of the ordinance.

Question #4 was introduced into the survey in an attempt to determine whether the expense associated with the installation of smoke detectors was a factor. The theory being that if the fire department would assume the expense and inconvenience of smoke detector installation, public support would grow stronger. Surprisingly, this was **NOT** the case. In fact just the opposite occurred. The

percentage of people supporting legislation dropped from 78% to 76%. Comments, included on the survey sheets, indicated that many people felt it was not the fire department's responsibility to provide such service. One respondent even felt it was an "irresponsible use of public money." It was decided to do a cross tabulation (Table 1) on the two questions in an attempt to isolate the issues.

Would you support an ordinance requiring smoke detectors in every private residence if the Fire Department would supply, install and maintain them? * Do you feel that the City should pass an ordinance that would require every private residence to be equipped with working smoke detectors? Crosstabulation

Count		Do you feel that the City should pass an ordinance that would require every private residence to be equipped with working smoke detectors?		Total
		Yes	No	
Would you support an ordinance requiring smoke detectors in every private residence if the Fire Department would supply, install and maintain them?	Yes	208	23	231
	No	28	44	72
Total		236	67	303

Table 1

When analyzing the cross tabulation an interesting situation develops. Two hundred and eight respondents answered "yes" to both questions. Only forty-four respondents answered "No" to both questions. Twenty-eight respondents originally supported the legislation but would change their position when the fire department got involved. Conversely, twenty-three people would support the legislation if the fire department would help them. If one considers just the common issue of smoke detector legislation, the fire department could count on almost 85% of the respondents to support the legislation. Less than 10% of the respondents took issue with the fire department helping but would otherwise support the ordinance. This is strong evidence that answers research question #2. The citizens of St. Bernard would accept legislation requiring the installation of smoke detectors in their homes.

The final research question had to do with whether the current fire department smoke detector programs were reaching the public. Was there a need for more intervention through education in that

regard?

Is the fire department's current smoke detector program effectively reaching the citizens?

5. *Are you aware that FREE batteries are available from the Fire Department for smoke detectors in private residences?*

YES 197 (70%)

NO 86 (30%)

6. *Are you aware that the Fire Department will come to your home to help you with a smoke detector related problem?*

YES 177 (63%)

NO 105 (37%)

Initially it would seem that with 70% of the respondents aware of the free batteries and 63% aware of maintenance and installation programs that the information about our programs was being effectively distributed. However, a closer evaluation of the data could be beneficial to improved performance of the programs. With this in mind, another cross tabulation was done using these two

Are you aware the FREE batteries are available from the Fire Department for smoke detectors in private residences? * Are you aware that the Fire Department will come to your home to help you with a smoke detector related problem? Crosstabulation

Count		Are you aware that the Fire Department will come to your home to help you with a smoke detector related problem?		Total
		Yes	No	
Are you aware the FREE batteries are available from the Fire Department for smoke detectors in private residences?	Yes	183	36	219
	No	15	75	90
Total		198	111	309

survey questions. The results are in table 2.

Table 2

The data indicates that over 24% (75) of the respondents had not heard of either program. Since a decision on the effectiveness of a program is somewhat subjective, depending on one's definition of effective, I would consider reaching 75% of the people as effective. However, is there room for improvement? It would depend on your individual perspective. Is the glass half full or half

empty?

Summary

The analysis of the responses to the citizen's survey clearly answers the three research questions.

4. The citizens of St. Bernard feel very strongly that smoke detectors should be installed in the home (99%).
5. A solid majority would accept legislation that would require the installation of these smoke detectors (85%).
6. The current fire department smoke detector programs are effectively reaching the citizens (75%) but there is room for improved effectiveness.

DISCUSSION

The literature review suggested one issue that could potentially be a major problem with a smoke detector ordinance was that of enforcement. It seemed that after an effective ordinance was on the books it became some other department's responsibility to enforce it (Coleman, 1992). To avoid such circumstances and their potential problems, a meeting was arranged with the Code Assistance Officer, Mr. Gerald Weidmann, to discuss any available options. During this meeting details were worked out so that paragraph (b) would be added to Section 1335.04 Enforcement Authority of the Property Maintenance Code (September 18, 1998).

- (a) The Fire Chief or his authorized representative shall have concurrent jurisdiction, powers and duties, as the code official with respect to application and enforcement of code sections 1335.71 through 1335.75 "Fire Safety Requirements" and code sections 1335.81 through 1335.84 "Fire Warning Systems".

The Property Maintenance Code would now provide for the joint enforcement for all fire-related

provisions of the code.

It is one thing to have enforcement powers. It is another thing on how those powers are applied. In the case of St. Bernard, I would envision using a positive reinforcement model such as the one on which Chief Gaiser (1993) reported. Canvassing the neighborhood with firefighters and trained volunteers and then publicly recognizing those homes that have complied with the ordinance is a great, easily applied idea. This model uses an education intervention while always having the enforcement capabilities available if somebody just will not cooperate.

At that point when somebody is recognized as reluctant to cooperate, then, Maughan's (1992) "Fixit Ticket" can be used to give the homeowner one more opportunity to comply before having to cite them to court. Hopefully, we may avoid a completely negative experience for the homeowner and still accomplish compliance. These are all policy options available to the fire department since it shares in the enforcement role.

The survey revealed a minor shortfall in an area where the fire department had previously felt comfortable. The survey indicated that almost twenty-five percent of our citizens had not been aware of any of our smoke detector programs available to them from the fire department. This fact warrants a closer look into the demographics of the respondents to determine if there is any way to improve our effectiveness and possibly gain some knowledge of the citizens to help with the application of the ordinance.

Overall, the data seems to indicate that the city of St. Bernard should have little difficulty with any sort of public outcry over a mandatory, comprehensive smoke detector ordinance. The respondents' answer to the survey questions reveal they realize the importance of smoke detectors and agree that all homes should be equipped with them. They validate the literature review from the aspect

that antagonists will exist but their numbers, although relatively small, will still require special attention to keep the program positive and effective.

Organizational implications are clear in that although comprehensive smoke detector legislation can be accomplished it will take a concentrated effort by the entire community to make the experience pleasant and long lasting. The fire department, in particular, will have to resist the urge to mandate compliance, instead, to coax it with special efforts in the public relations arena. The fire department will be the central source from where all other organizations and volunteers will derive their strength and authority. Through example, this will present the department an excellent opportunity to lead the entire community to safer homes as well as an enhanced work environment.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The citizens of St. Bernard overwhelmingly believe that smoke detectors should be installed in the home. Furthermore, the citizens also indicated in the survey that they would accept legislation requiring the installation and maintenance of smoke detection equipment in their homes. Therefore, I recommend that the Safety Committee prepare an ordinance for adoption that would modify the Property Maintenance Code of the City St. Bernard to require every occupancy in the city of St. Bernard to comply with NFPA 72, 72E and 72H. (Appendix A)

Furthermore, I would also recommend that the fire department develop some positive approaches to compliance such as the ones discussed in the literature review. These approaches should be used to promote and reinforce the department's current smoke detector programs. According to the survey, there are some households unaware of them. Additionally, these programs should be directed to the problem of smoke detector maintenance, which the literature review presented as a serious problem

nationwide.

REFERENCE LIST

- Bright, J. (1992, January). *Review of Smoke Detector Ordinance Ten Years Later*. Applied Research Paper, LRC, Emmitsburg, MD.
- Bukowski, Richard. (1993, Jan/Feb). *Studies Assess Performance of Residential Detectors*. NFPA Journal, January/February, 1993. p48-54.
- Bunker, Merton. (1998, Nov/Dec). *The ABC's of Alarms*. NFPA Journal, November/December, 1998. p26 cont. on 127.
- Coleman, J. (1992, May). *Enforcement of Smoke Detector Ordinances*. Applied Research Paper, LRC, Emmitsburg, MD.
- Conley, Christopher; Fahy, Rita. (1994, May/June). *Who Dies in Fires in the United States?* NFPA Journal, May/June, 1994. p99-106.
- Gaiser, K. (1993, August). *Effectiveness of Smoke Detector Legislation in the City of Georgetown, South Carolina*. Applied Research Paper, LRC, Emmitsburg, MD.
- Hall, J. Jr., Harwood, B. (1995, Jan/Feb). *Smoke or Burns - Which is Deadlier?* NFPA Journal, January/February, 1995. p38-43.
- Hall, J. Jr. (1994, Sept/Oct). *The U.S. Experience with Smoke Detectors: Who Has Them? How Well Do They Work? Who Has Them?* NFPA Journal, September/October, 1994. p36-46.
- Krejcie, R. Morgan D. (1970). *Determining Sample Size for Research Activities* Educational Psychological Measurement, Vol. 30, 607-610.
- Maughan, G. (1992, November). *Why West Valley City Should Adopt a Mandatory Smoke Detector Ordinance*. Applied Research Paper, LRC, Emmitsburg, MD.

Mikesell, John, (1995, July). Fiscal Administration: Analysis and Applications for the Public Sector (4th ed.). Wadsworth Publishing Company

Smith, L., Smith, C., Ayres, J. (1997, Sept/Oct). *When Detectors Don't Work*. NFPA Journal, September/October, 1997. p40-45.

U. S. Department of Commerce (1993, February). Protecting your Family from Fire. FA 130.

U.S. Fire Administration (1997a, July). Fire in the United States, 1985-1994 (9th ed.). FA-173. FEMA, National Fire Data Center.

U.S. Fire Administration (1997b, April). Strategic Analysis of Community Risk Reduction (SACRR-SM). FEMA/NFA.

U.S. Fire Administration (1997c, June). Fire Death Rate Trends FA 169. FEMA, National Fire Center.

Appendix A

ORDINANCE NO. 38, 1998

AMENDING THE CITY OF ST. BERNARD CODIFIED ORDINANCES, CHAPTER 1335, THE PROPERTY MAINTENANCE CODE TO REQUIRE FIRE DETECTION EQUIPMENT FOR ALL BUILDINGS IN ST. BERNARD, AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY.

WHEREAS, fire detection equipment reduces the risk of death and injury by providing early warnings to individuals of potential fires and related dangers; and

WHEREAS, fire detection equipment and smoke detectors placed throughout residential dwellings reduce the risk of death and injury and saves lives through early fire and smoke detection; and

WHEREAS, the City of St. Bernard intends to protect the health and safety of all residents by developing a program to assist residents with the placement and upkeep of fire detection equipment in all residential dwellings; and

WHEREAS, along with a program to assist residents with the placement and upkeep of smoke detection equipment, the City intends to require that all residential dwellings have properly located and operational fire detection equipment; and

WHEREAS, the City of St. Bernard Council intends that this legislation take effect upon passage of this ordinance, however, the enforcement of this ordinance through the issuance of violations shall not become effective until the beginning of the year 2000; now therefore,

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ST. BERNARD, STATE OF OHIO:

Section 1. The City of St. Bernard Codified Ordinances, Chapter 1335, Property Maintenance Code shall be amended as follows: (Amendments are shown in bold print. Those sections of the code being repealed have a "strike through" line placed through the respective section or wording.)

Section 1334.04 shall be amended as follows:

1335.04 Enforcement Authority

(b) Officer It shall be the duty and responsibility of the code official to enforce the provisions _____ of this code as herein provided.

(c) **The Fire Chief or his authorized representative shall have concurrent jurisdiction, powers and duties, as the code official with respect to application and enforcement of code sections 1335.71 through 1335.75 "Fire Safety Requirements" and code sections 1335.81 through**

1335.84 "Fire Warning Systems".

- (c) Relief from Personal Liability. Any code official, officer or employee who acts in good faith and without malice in the discharge of his duties of enforcement of this code is relieved of all personal liability for any damage that may accrue to persons or property as a result of such acts or alleged failure to act. Further, he shall not be held liable for any costs in any action, suit or proceeding that may be instituted by him in the enforcement of this code. In any of these actions, the official or employee shall be defended or represented by the jurisdiction's attorney-at-law until the final termination of the proceedings.
- (d) Official Records. An official record shall be kept of all business and activities of the department _____ specified in the provisions of this code, and all such records shall be open to public inspection at all appropriate times and under reasonable regulations established by the code official to maintain the integrity and security of such records.

(Ord. 41-1980. Passed 9-4-80 Amended Ord. 38-1998)

DEFINITIONS

1335.21 GENERAL

- (a) Scope. Unless otherwise expressly stated, the following terms shall, for the purpose of this code, have the meanings indicated in this section and Section 1335.22
- (b) Interchangeability. Words used in the present tense include the future; words in the masculine gender include the feminine and neuter; and the singular number includes the plural and plural the singular.
- (c) Terms Defined in Other Codes. Where terms are not defined in this code and are defined in the Building, Plumbing and/or Mechanical Codes, they shall have the same meanings ascribed to them as in those Codes.
- (d) Terms Not Defined. Where terms are not defined under the provisions of this code or under the provisions of the Building, Plumbing and/or Mechanical Codes, they shall have ascribed to them their ordinarily accepted meanings or such as the context herein may imply.

(Ord. 41-1980. Passed 9-4-80)

1335.22 APPLIED MEANING OF WORDS AND TERMS

- (a) As used in this Property Maintenance Code certain terms are defined as follows:

(1) "Approved" as applied to a material device, or method of construction means approved

by the code official under the provisions of this code, or approved by other authority designated by law to give approval in the matter in question.

- (2) **"Assembly, places of"** means all structures which are designed or occupied for the gathering together of persons for purposes such as civic, social or religious functions, recreation, food or drink consumption or awaiting transportation. This use group shall include all theaters and all other building and structures intended for the production and viewing of performing arts or motion pictures; including theaters, motion picture theaters and television and radio studios admitting an audience. All buildings and places of public assembly designed for occupancy as dance halls, nightclubs and for similar purposes, including all rooms, lobbies and other spaces connected thereto with a common *means of egress* and entrance. All buildings with or without an auditorium in which persons assemble for amusement, entertainment or recreation purposes as well as incidental motion picture, dramatic or theatrical presentations, lectures or other similar purposes, this includes art galleries, exhibition halls, museums, lecture halls, libraries, restaurants and recreation centers and buildings designed for similar assembly purposes. All buildings and structures which are occupied exclusively for the purpose of worship or other religious services.
- (3) "Basement" means that portion of a building which is partly below and partly above grade, and having at least one-half its height above grade. (see "Cellar")
- (4) "Building Code" means the Building Code officially adopted by the legislative body of this jurisdiction, or such other code as may be officially designated by the legislative body of the jurisdiction for the regulation of construction, alteration, addition, repair, removal, demolition, use, location, occupancy and maintenance of buildings and structures.
- (5) "Building official" means the official designated by the jurisdiction to enforce building, zoning or similar laws, or his duly authorized representative.
- (6) **"Businesses"** means all buildings and structures which are occupied for the transaction of business, for the rendering of professions services, or for other services that involve stocks of goods, wares or merchandise.
- (7) "Cellar" means that portion of a building which is partly or completely below grade, and having at least one-half its height below grade. (see "Basement")
 - (8) "Central heating" means the heating system permanently installed and adjusted so as to provide the distribution of heat to all habitable rooms, bathroom and water closet compartments from a source outside of these rooms.
 - (9) "Code official" means the official who is charged with the administration and enforcement of this code, or any duly authorized representative.
 - (10) "Condemn" means to adjudge unfit the use or occupancy.
 - (11) "Condemnation" means the act of judicially condemning.
 - (12) "Dwellings":
 - A. "One-family dwelling" means a building containing one dwelling unit with not more than five lodgers or boarders.
 - B. "Two-family dwelling" means a building containing two dwelling units with not more than five lodgers or boarders per family, but not more than twenty individuals.
 - C. "Multi-family-apartment house" means a building or portion thereof containing more

- than two dwelling units and not classified as a one or two-family dwelling.
- D. "Boarding house, tourist house" means a building arranged or used for the lodging with or without meals, for compensation, by more than five and not more than twenty individuals.
 - E. "Lodging house" means any building or portion thereof containing not more than five guest rooms which are used by not more than five guests where rent is paid in money, goods, labor or otherwise. A "lodging house" shall comply with all the requirements for dwellings.
 - F. "Dormitory" means a space in a building where group sleeping accommodations are provided for persons not members of the same family group, in one room, or in a series of closely associated rooms.
 - G. "Hotel" means any building containing six or more guest rooms intended or designed to be used, or which are used, rented or hired out to be occupied or which are occupied for sleeping purposes by guests.
- (13) "Dwelling unit" means a single unit providing complete, independent living facilities for one or more persons including permanent provisions for living, sleeping, eating, cooking and sanitation.
 - (14) **"Education facilities" means all structures for educational purposes including among others, schools, colleges, universities, a child day care center or a child care facility. Structures occupied for business training or vocational training.**
 - (15) "Enforcement officer" means the official designated herein or otherwise charged with the responsibilities of administering this code, or his authorized representative.
 - (16) "Exterior property areas" means the open space on the premises and on adjoining property under the control of owners or operators of such premises.
 - (17) "Extermination" means the control and elimination of insects, rodents or other pests by eliminating their harborage places; by removing or making inaccessible materials that may serve as their food; by poison spraying, fumigating, trapping, or by any other approved pest elimination methods.
 - (18) **"Factory and industrial facilities" means all structures in which occupants are engaged in work or labor in the fabricating, assembling or processing of products or materials. This includes, among others, factories, assembling plants, industrial laboratories and all other industrial and manufacturing occupancies.**
 - (19) "Family" means an individual or married couple and the children thereof with not more than two other persons related directly to the individual or married couple by blood or marriage; or a group of not more than five unrelated (excluding servants) persons, living together as a single housekeeping unit in a dwelling unit.
 - (20) "Garbage" means the animal and vegetable waste resulting from the handling, preparation, cooking and consumption of food.
 - (21) "Habitable space" means space in a structure for living, sleeping, eating or cooking. Bathrooms, toilet compartments, closets, halls, storage or utility space and similar areas are not considered habitable space.
 - (22) **"High hazard facilities" means all structures which are occupied for the manufacturing, processing, generation, storage or other use of hazardous**

materials.

- (23) "Hotel". See "dwellings"
- (24) "Infestation" means the presence, within or contiguous to, a structure or premises of insects, rodents, vermin or other pests.
- (25) **"Institutional structures" means all structures in which people suffering from physical limitations because of health or age are harbored for medical or other care or treatment, or in which people are detained for penal or correction purposes, or in which the liberty of the inmates is restricted. This shall include buildings and structures, or parts thereof, which house individuals who, because of mental or physical disability or other reasons, must live in a supervised environment. Rest homes.**
- (26) "Junk vehicles" means any vehicle which is without a currently valid license plate or plates and is in either a rusted, wrecked, discharged, dismantled, partly dismantled, inoperative or abandoned condition. A "junked vehicle" shall be classified as to its condition in one of the two following categories:
 - A. Restorable: A junked vehicle that is in a condition whereby repairs to same could be made to place it in operating condition without exceeding the estimated value when repaired.
 - B. Wreck: A junked vehicle in such condition that it is economically unsound to restore same to operating condition considering the repairs to be made, age of the vehicle, market value of the vehicle if it were restored or in such **condition** that the public officer, in his opinion determines that it warrants such clarification.

The code official shall make the final determination as to the classification to be assigned to any one particular vehicle.
- (27) "Let for occupancy" or "let" means to permit possession or occupancy of a dwelling, dwelling unit, rooming unit, building or structure by a person who shall be legal owner or not be the legal owner of record thereof, pursuant to a written or unwritten lease, agreement or license, or pursuant to a recorded or unrecorded agreement of contract for the sale of land.
- (28) "Maintenance" means conformance of a building and its facilities to the code under which the building was constructed.
- (29) **"Mercantile structures" means all buildings and structures which are occupied for display and sales purposes involving stocks of goods, wares or merchandise incidental to such purposes and open to the public. This includes, among others, retail stores, automotive service stations, shops, sales-rooms and markets.**
- (30) "Motel" means a hotel as defined in this code.
- (31) "Multi-family (multiples) dwellings." See "dwellings".
- (32) "Occupant" means any person over one year of age (including owner or operator) living and sleeping in a dwelling unit or having actual possession of said dwelling or rooming unit.
- (33) "Openable area" means that part of a window or door which is available for unobstructed ventilation and which opens directly to the outdoors.
- (34) "Operator" means any person who has charge, care or control of a structure or premises which are let or offered for occupancy.

- (35) "Owner" means any person, agent, firm or corporation having a legal or equitable interest in the property.
- (36) "Person" includes a corporation or co-partnership as well as an individual.
- (37) "Plumbing" means the practice, materials and fixtures used in the installation, maintenance, extension and alteration of all piping, fixtures, appliances and appurtenances within the scope of the plumbing code.
- (38) "Plumbing fixture" means a receptacle or device which is either permanently or temporarily connected to the water distribution system of the premises, and demands a supply of water therefrom; or discharges used water, liquid-borne waste materials, or sewage either directly or indirectly to the drainage system of the premises; or which required both a water supply connection and a discharge to the drainage system of the premises.
- (39) "Premises" means a lot, plot or parcel of land including the building or structures thereon.
- (40) "Public nuisance" includes the following:
 - A. The physical condition, or use of any premises regarded as a public nuisance at common law; or
 - B. Any physical condition, use or occupancy of any premises or its appurtenances considered an attractive nuisance to children, including, but not limited to, abandoned wells, shafts, basements, excavations and unsafe fences or structures; or
 - C. Any premises which have unsanitary sewerage or plumbing facilities; or
 - D. Any premises designated as unsafe for human habitation or use; or
 - E. Any premises which are manifestly capable of being a fire hazard, or are manifestly unsafe or unsecured as to endanger life, limb or property; or
 - F. Any premises from which the plumbing, heating, and/or facilities required by this code have been removed, or from which utilities have been disconnected, destroyed, removed or rendered ineffective, or the required precautions against trespassers have not been provided; or
 - G. Any premises which are unsanitary, or which are littered with rubbish or garbage, or which have an uncontrolled growth of weeds; or
 - H. Any structure or building that is in a state of dilapidation, deterioration or decay; faulty construction; overcrowded; open, vacant or abandoned; damaged by fire to the extent as not to provide shelter, in danger of collapse or failure and is dangerous to anyone on or near the premises.
- (41) "Renovation" means a building and its facilities made to conform to present day minimum standards of sanitation, fire and life safety.
- (42) "Residence building" means a building in which sleeping accommodations ~~or sleeping accommodations~~ and cooking facilities as a unit are provided, except when classified as an institution under the building code.
- (43) "Rooming house" means any residence building, or any part thereof, containing one or more rooming units, in which space is let by the owner or operator to more than five persons who are not members of the family. (See "dwellings, boarding house")
- (44) "Rooming unit" means any room or group of rooms forming a single habitable unit used or intended to be used for living and sleeping, but not for cooking or eating purposes.
- (45) "Rubbish" means combustible and noncombustible waste materials, except garbage. The

terms include the residue from the burning of wood, coal, coke and other combustible materials, paper, rags, cartons, boxes, wood, excelsior, rubber, leather, tree branches, yard trimmings, tin cans, metals, mineral matter, glass, crockery and dust and other similar materials.

- (46) **"Storage facilities" means all structures which are primarily used for the storage of goods, wares or merchandise. This includes, among others, warehouses, storehouses and freight depots.**
 - (47) "Structure" means that which is built or constructed, including without limitation because of enumeration, building for any occupancy or use whatsoever, fences, signs, billboards, fire escapes, stairway, chute escapes, railings, water tanks, towers, open grade steps, sidewalks or stairways, tents or anything erected and framed of component parts which is fastened, anchored or rests on a permanent foundation or on the ground.
 - (48) "Supplied" means installed, furnished or provided by the owner or operator.
 - (49) **"Utility and miscellaneous structures" means buildings and structures of an accessory character and miscellaneous structures not classified in any specific use group such as *private garages and sheds*.**
 - (50) "Ventilation" means the process of supplying and removing air by natural or mechanical means to or from any space.
 - A. "Mechanical" means ventilation by power-driven devices.
 - B. "Natural" means ventilation by opening to outer air through windows, skylights, doors, louvers or stacks without wind drive devices.
 - (51) "Workmanlike". Whenever the words "workmanlike state of maintenance and repair" are used in this code, they shall mean that such maintenance and repair shall be made in a reasonably skillful manner.
 - (52) "Yard" means an open unoccupied space on the same lot with a building extending along the entire length of a street, or rear or interior lot line.
- (b) Whenever the words "multi-family building", "residence building", "dwelling unit", "rooming house", "rooming unit" or "premises" are used in this code, they shall be construed as though they were followed by the words, "or any part thereof".

(Ord. 41-1980. Passed 9-4-80 Amended Ord. 38-1998)

Sections 1335.81 through 1335.84 shall be amended as follows:

FIRE WARNING SYSTEMS

1335.81 GENERAL

The provisions of Sections 1335.81 through 1335.84 shall govern the minimum requirements for the provision of early warning systems in specified **residential** structures.

(Ord. 41-1980. Passed 9-4-80 Amended Ord. 38, 1998)

1335.82 EARLY FIRE WARNING SYSTEM REQUIRED

- (a) Applicability. Except as provided in subsection (b) hereof, a minimum early fire warning system shall be installed and in operation in every ~~three or more~~ family dwelling, apartment, condominium unit, dormitory building **and places of assembly, business, education, mercantile, high hazard, institutional, storage, factory and industrial, utility and miscellaneous** which does not have an automatic smoke detection system or sprinkler system in conformity with the rules of the Board of Building Standards adopted pursuant to Ohio R. C. 3781.10.
 - (b) Exception. Buildings which have an automatic smoke alarms system or an automatic sprinkler system in conformance with the Ohio Basic Building Code shall be deemed to conform to the rules of the Board of Building Standards.
 - (c) Exceeding Minimum Requirements. Nothing in Sections 1335.81 through 1335.84 is intended to preclude installation of equipment and systems which feature additional life safety or security provisions provided said installations are not less stringent nor in conflict with the intent of the rules contained herein and further provided that plans or schematics for all installations have been approved by the chief enforcement official.
 - (d) Original Installation. No installation shall result in a system or condition less safe than the original installation.
- (Ord. 41-1980. Passed 9-4-80 Amended Ord. 38-1998)

1335.83 DETECTORS REQUIRED WITHIN PRIVATE AREAS

- (a) Location. Each dwelling unit, apartment, and condominium unit **and dormitory building** shall have at least one smoke detector installed in the immediate vicinity but outside of all sleeping rooms. **Each dwelling unit, apartment and condominium unit shall have at least one smoke detector installed on every level of the dwelling unit, apartment, condominium unit, dormitory building. Places of assembly, business, education, mercantile, high hazard, institutional, storage, factory and industrial, utility and miscellaneous shall install and maintain as specified in subsection (b) hereof.** Alarm signaling devices shall be clearly audible in all bedroom within the dwelling unit, apartment, condominium unit **or dormitory building** when all intervening doors are closed.
- (b) Standard for Installation and Maintenance. For the purpose of installation and maintenance only, the applicable sections of the National Fire Protection Association Standard No. 74, titled "Standard for the Installation and Maintenance and Use of Household Fire Warning Equipment" shall be considered accepted engineering practice **for family dwelling, apartment, condominium unit, dormitory building only. For all other occupancies the fire detection equipment, installation and maintenance shall meet or exceed the National Electric Code Article 760, National Fire Protection Standard 72, National Fire Protection Standard 72E, National Fire Protection Standard 72H, ADA Federal Guidelines, UL**

and FM approval and any and all other local codes set forth by the Authorities Having Jurisdiction. At least one appropriate detection device shall be installed in every unprotected room and/or hallway of every designated unprotected building. More shall be required installed if required by the aforementioned Standard, Guidelines or Codes.

- (c) Testing and Certification of Systems. Smoke detectors shall be tested, certified and labeled to be in compliance with the Underwriters Laboratories, Inc., Standard No. 217, titled "Standard for Single and Multiple Station Smoke Detectors".

(Ord. 41-1980. Passed 9-4-80 Amended Ord. 38-1998)

- (d) Maintenance. It shall be the responsibility of the occupant(s) of each dwelling unit, apartment and condominium unit **and dormitory building** to maintain or to have maintained the smoke detector(s) in that unit, whether or not such occupant is the owner. For the purpose of this section, maintain or have maintained means:

- (1) In the case of a battery operated device, the replacement of batteries when expired; and
- (2) In the event the detector is inoperable due to malfunction, the owner shall be notified to repair and/or replace the unit; and
- (3) In the event the detector is an AC electrically power system, the building owner shall be notified of the inoperative status of the detector and be responsible for its repair and/or replacement.

(Ord. 30-1989. Passed 5-18-89 Amended Ord. 38-1998)

1335.84 LOCATION OF DETECTORS WITHIN PUBLIC (NONPRIVATE) AREAS.

- (a) Location. In those portions of a building subject to the provisions of this chapter other than the private dwelling or sleeping areas, smoke detectors shall be installed in conformance with at least one of the following requirements:

- (1) Where the building has a central return air system, a detector shall be installed in or near each return air stream in a manner that smoke-laden air originating from any part of the building must pass by a detector before the smoke laden air leaves the floor of origin; or
- (2) In buildings with or without central return air systems, detectors shall be installed on each floor on the corridor or lobby side of and within five feet of all stairway and elevator doors. Where horizontal exits are used, detectors shall also be installed on each side of and within fifteen feet of doors serving as horizontal exits through fire walls.

- (b) Audibility. Detectors installed in conformity with the provisions of subsection (a) hereof shall be clearly audible in all private or dormitory sleeping areas on that floor.

- (c) Standards Testing and Certification. **All** detectors shall comply with ~~all requirements of the~~ **appropriate** Underwriter's Laboratories, Inc. **standard for its type and model** ~~Standard 167, titled "Standard for Smoke Detectors, Combustion Products Type, for Fire Protective Signaling Systems," or Standard No. 168, titled "Standard for Smoke Detectors, Photoelectric Type, for Fire Protective Signaling Systems,"~~ and shall be tested, labeled and certified to be in compliance

therewith.

- (d) Accessibility. All detectors shall be readily accessible for servicing and testing.
(Ord. 41-1980. Passed 9-4-80 Amended Ord. 38-1998)
- (e) Maintenance. It shall be the responsibility of the building owner to maintain or have maintained any smoke detectors installed as required by subsection (a) hereof. For the purposes of this subsection, maintain and have maintained means:
- (1) In the case of a battery operated device, the replacement of batteries when expired; and
 - (2) In the event the detector is inoperable due to malfunction, the owner shall be notified to repair and/or replace the unit; and
 - (3) In the event the detector is an AC electrically powered system, the building owner shall be notified of the inoperative status of the detector and be responsible for its repair and/or replacement.
- (Ord. 30-1989. Passed 5-18-89 Amended Ord. 38-1998)

Section 2. The amendments to the St. Bernard Codified Ordinances as set forth in this ordinance shall take effect immediately, upon proper passage as prescribed and provided by applicable law. The enforcement of these amendments, through the application of section 1335.10 "Violations and Penalties" shall not be effective until January 1, 2000.

Section 3. This Ordinance is hereby declared to be an emergency measure necessary to the immediate preservation of the public peace, health and safety. The reason for the emergency is to have ordinance passed during National Fire Prevention Week. Therefore, this Ordinance shall take effect immediately by and upon its passage, and the approval of two-thirds of the members of said Council. However, this Ordinance shall take effect on the earliest date provided by law if approved by no more than the majority of the members of Council and in that event the emergency provisions herein are set at naught.

Passed this _____ day of _____, 1998.

President of Council

ATTEST:

Clerk of Council

Approved this _____ day of _____, 1998.

Mayor

I, DARLENE A. BOLLMER, CLERK OF COUNCIL, CITY OF ST. BERNARD, STATE OF OHIO, DO HEREBY testify that the publication of Ordinance No. 38, 1998, was made by posting true copies of the same in the most public places designated by Council: St. Bernard Square Bus Stop; Vine Street and Washington Avenue; Bertus Street Park; Greenlee Avenue and Jefferson Avenue; Sullivan Avenue and Delmar Avenue; each for a period of fifteen (15) days or more commencing _____, 1998.

ATTEST: _____ DATE _____
Clerk of Council

Appendix B

SMOKE DETECTORS

It has been proven that working smoke detectors can save lives. St. Bernard now has an ordinance requiring that all rental property of three or more families must have working smoke detectors installed in them. All new homes built today are also required by law to have working smoke detectors whether it is rental property or a private residence.

1. Do you feel that the City should pass an ordinance to require smoke detectors in **ALL** rental property?

YES _____

NO _____

2. Do you feel that every private residence should have working smoke detectors?

YES _____

NO _____

3. Do you feel that the City should pass an ordinance that would require every private residence to be equipped with working smoke detectors?

YES _____

NO _____

4. Would you support an ordinance requiring smoke detectors in every private residence if the Fire Department would supply, install and help maintain them?

YES _____

NO _____

5. Are you aware that **FREE** batteries are available from the Fire Department for smoke detectors in private residences?

YES _____

NO _____

6. Are you aware that the Fire Department will come to your home to help you with a smoke detector related problem?

YES _____

NO _____